DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 398 JC 900 042

AUTHOR	Fullen, James, Ed.
TITLE	OATYC Journal, Vol. III, No. 1, Winter 1978.
INSTITUTION	Ohio Association of Two-Year Colleges.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	37p.; This journal is being entered into ERIC, one year's worth at a time, with "Table of Contents" type abstracts, in order to provide indexing access to the individual articles via the text of the abstract.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT	OATYC Journal; v3 n1 Win 1978
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Instruction; College Programs; Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; *Instructional Improvement; Professional Associations; *Professional Development; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Ohio

ABSTRACT

"OATYC Journal," which is published by the Ohio Association of Two-Year Colleges, is designed as a forum for the exchange of concepts, methods, and findings relevant to the two-year college classroom. Along with commentaries and letters of reaction from the readership, the Winter 1978 issue presents the following articles: (1) "Statewide Efforts to Improve Teaching and Learning in Ohio Higher Education: The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development," by Sandra Inglis and Stephen Scholl; (2) "Faculty Development; A View from (Near) the Top," by Harold H. Brown; (3) "Organizational Development for Higher Education," by Walter Sikes; (4) "OATYC Focus on the Wayne General and Technical College," by John C. Hedrick; (5) "Teaming...The Road to Professional Development at Clark Technical College," by Albert A. Salerno; (6) "Issue: Should the Ohio Board of Regents Provide Categorical Funding for Faculty Development Program?" by Charles Warman, who opposes categorical funding, and Edward Florak, who feels it can be an asset; (7) "Selecting the Right Criteria for Evaluation," by Carol Zion and Suzanne Richter; and (8) "Faculty Evaluation in an Accountable World: How Do You Do It?" by Clare Rose. (UCM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340398

JC 900 042

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James D. Cullen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OATYC JOURNAL

VOL. III NO. 1 WINTER 1978

THE OHIO ASSOCIATION OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

THIS ISSUE

PRESIDENT'S COMMENT

Commitment, Not Just Involvement

COMMENT

About This Issue

TEXT

Statewide Efforts to Improve Teaching and Learning in Ohio Higher Education

Faculty Development: A View (Near) the Top

Organizational Development for Higher Education

OATYC Focus on the Wayne General and Technical College

PRACTICUM

Teaming: The Road to Professional Development

FORUM

Should the Ohio Board of Regents Provide Categorical Funding for Faculty Development Programs?

PLUS ONE

Selecting the Right Criteria for Evaluation

Faculty Evaluation in an Accountable World: How Do You Do It?

REACTION

Reaction to OATYC Conference November 4-5, 1977

JOURNAL

OF THE OHIO ASSOCIATION OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

Vol. III No. 1 Winter 1978

The *Journal of The Ohio Association of Two-Year Colleges* is published by the Association to provide the two-year colleges of Ohio with a medium for the sharing of concepts, methods and findings relevant to the two-year college classroom and to provide an open forum for problem discussion and review.

Subscription is part of OATYC active, associate, or institutional membership. However, single copies of the *Journal* are available for $3 each. A yearly subscription is available for $6 to persons or organizations who do not want membership in the OATYC. Postage is prepaid on all orders within the U.S.; $.50 per year is added for Canada, $1 per year for all other foreign countries. Communications regarding orders, special subscriptions, single copies, advertising, and permission to reprint are to be addressed to:

The Ohio Association of Two-Year Colleges
c/o University of Akron
302 East Buchtel Avenue
Akron, Ohio 44325

JOURNAL OFFICERS

Dr. James Fullen, Editor, Central Ohio Technical College
Dr. William Coleman, Assistant Editor, Central Ohio Technical College
Mr. Charles Pressler, Business Manager, Central Ohio Technical College
Ms. Lorita Langdon, Circulation Manager, Columbus Technical Institute

EDITORIAL BOARD

Mr. Frank Fletcher, Columbus Technical Institute
Ms. Elizabeth Hall, Central Ohio Technical College
Mr. Richard Matthews, Cuyahoga Community College
Dr. David Miller, Michael J. Owens Technical College
Dr. Lloyd Monnin, Clark Technical College

READERS

Dr. Harold Brown, Columbus Technical Institute
Sister Remigia, Lourdes College
Dr. Len Slominski, Lakeland Community College
Mr. Jack Tabor, Columbus Technical Institute

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMENT

President's Comments: Commitment, Not Just Involvement – Thurman Grass . . 2

About This Issue – Sandra Inglis and Harold Brown 4

TEXT

Statewide Efforts to Improve Teaching and Learning in Ohio Higher Education: The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development – Sandra Cheldelin-Inglis, Ohio Board of Regents and Stephen C. Scholl, Ohio Wesleyan University 5

Faculty Development: A View (Near) the Top – Harold H. Brown, Columbus Technical Institute 7

Organizational Development for Higher Education – Walter Sikes, Center for Creative Change 11

OATYC Focus on the Wayne General and Technical College – John G. Hedrick, The Wayne General and Technical College 13

PRACTICUM

Teaming: The Road to Professional Development – Albert A. Salerno, Clark Technical College 14

FORUM

Should the Ohio Board of Regents Provide Categorical Funding for Faculty Development Programs? 18

Why I Oppose Categorical Funding – Charles Warman, Cincinnati Technical College

Categorical Funding Can Be An Asset – Edward Florak, Jefferson Technical Institute

PLUS ONE

Selecting the Right Criteria for Evaluation – Carol Zion and Suzanne Richter, Miami Dade Community College 20

Faculty Evaluation in an Accountable World: How Do You Do It? – Clare Rose, Evaulation and Training Institute 23

REACTION

Reaction to OATYC Conference – November 4-5, 1977 Charles Pressler, Central Ohio Technical College 27

Reaction to OATYC Conference – November 4-5, 1977 Michael P. Roetter, The Michael J. Owens Technical College 27

Information for Prospective Contributors 29

Policy Change 29

OATYC Journal Campus Solicitors 29

PRESIDENT'S COMMENT: COMMITMENT, NOT JUST INVOLVEMENT

Thurman Grass

A chicken and pig were walking down the street, when the chicken spied a sign on a restaurant window: "Ham and eggs $1.50." The chicken remarked, "Isn't it great that we are involved in something." Whereupon the pig came back with, "You may be involved, but I am committed."

The momentous question now facing the members of OATYC is: Are you involved or are you committed? Involvement implies a rather passive participation in an already existing program. Committment, on the other hand, implies an active role in an already existing program, and at the same time a creative responsibility to the organization. The OATYC program is:

1. To provide an organization in which all groups related to two-year colleges (administrators, faculty and support staff) can discuss mutual problems and act to resolve them.
2. To foster cooperation and communication between member institutions.
3. To provide a representative voice giving the viewpoint of two-year colleges to the Ohio Board of Regents and the State Legislature.
4. To identify and improve the status, prestige and welfare of all two-year colleges in Ohio.
5. To cooperate with other Ohio agencies, organizations, colleges and universities in research and activities that promote the effectiveness of higher education in Ohio.
6. To promote articulation among the institutions of education in Ohio.
7. To take such action as will increase the contribution of the two-year colleges to the total education processes in the State of Ohio.

If you are committed to OATYC, its goals, and the students those goals represent, then the organization can only grow and prosper.

As a result of our 1977 Conference, I would like to share with you a few of my concerns. Our first consideration should be directed to the reason for our existence: Are we meeting the needs of our membership and the students they serve? Is it possible that we, as an organization, once served a utilitarian purpose; but have since slipped into obsolescence? For this reason, I am calling for a Task Force, consisting of past program chairpersons, to examine and possibly re-haul our conference.

A second concern deals with the five plus organizations that have scheduled their meetings at the same time. Their groups not only conflict with each other, but also with the OATYC Conference.

If you would supply me with the names and telephone numbers of persons involved in these organizations, then OATYC would be willing to serve as a clearning house for the scheduling of these meetings.

A third concern involves our *Journal*. This is one of the best journals of its kind and you have helped make it so. However, if the *Journal* is to continue, it needs your (our) support and active participation.

All of these concerns or challenges can be overcome, if we are committed, not just involved, to the OATYC and the students we serve. The future of our conference and the organization itself depends upon our commitment. As your President for 1977-78, I remain committed to the goals and needs of the membership, if I am aware of those needs. I encourage you to write and share with me *your* concerns.

Thurman Grass
OATYC President
North Central Technical College
Mansfield, OH 44906

COMMENT
ABOUT THIS ISSUE . . .

Sandra Inglis and Harold Brown

Sandra Inglis

Harold Brown

This edition on faculty development is the first theme-oriented OATYC JOURNAL. Recognition and thanks are extended the Winter 1978 JOURNAL's Guest Editors, Dr. Sandra Inglis and Dr. Harold Brown, who developed and solicited this edition's theme materials.

Faculty development, or if you like, professional development (which seems to be gaining as a more acceptable term because it is more inclusive), is receiving much attention from an increasing number of colleges and universities across the country. In fact, so many institutions and individuals have become involved in this movement that its practitioners consider it to be a new profession. It has its own organization, POD Network (Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education) which holds national conferences, national training workshops and publishes its own newspaper.

Within Ohio, we can boast of a greater number of post-secondary institutions actively engaged in faculty development programs than any other state. A primary factor in this increased activity has been the coordinating efforts of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development.

In spite of this flurry of activities, there remain many institutions who have

no faculty development programs or programs which consist of nothing more than the annual one-day faculty orientation meeting. There still exists the assumption that all that is needed to be an effective teacher is subject matter expertise.

The advent of the new student (culturally and educationally deprived, minorities, the handicapped, dropouts, and part-time adult learner) who is appearing in larger numbers, especially at the two-year colleges, is presenting new and difficult challenges to the faculty. Changes such as this along with many others will cause the colleges to reassign higher priorities to development programs if the colleges hope to assure maximum quality in the teaching-learning process.

It appears to us there is a clear need for increased emphasis on faculty development and this issue of the journal takes the opportunity to reflect, focus, and bring to the attention of the reader some of the aspects of this new profession.

Sandra Cheldelin Inglis
Harold H. Brown
Guest Editors

TEXT

STATEWIDE EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TEACHING AND LEARNING IN OHIO HIGHER EDUCATION:

The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development

Sandra Inglis and Stephen Scholl

Ohio has taken the leadership in the recent growth of attention to instructional and faculty development in postsecondary education. Perhaps no other state has as many active institutional programs for the improvement of teaching and learning. Over half of the more than 100 colleges, universities, and technical schools in Ohio have permanent programs or are well on their way to initiating systematic efforts to improve instruction. Each major consortium operating in Ohio (the East Central College Consortium, The Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, The Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and Universities, The Great Lakes Colleges Association, Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium, Northwest Ohio Consortium, The Ohio Colleges Association) is contemplating or sponsoring an active program for professional development in teaching.

Some of Ohio's heightened interest in instructional development has been spurred on by the state's Board of Regents. In 1973 the Chancellor of the Board of Regents called for a statewide conference on teaching and appointed a

Conference Planning Committee. This committee was composed of representatives of varied types of institutions of higher education: public and private, four-year and two-year, professional, technical and liberal arts. The resulting Chancellor's Conference on Promoting Effective Teaching, which convened at Bowling Green State University in February, 1974, drew teams from 52 institutions.

Following this encouraging response of Ohio's educators, the Conference Planning Committee was transformed into the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development (CACID). During the 1974-75 academic year this new committee, with $40,000 budgeted by the Board, was charged by the Chancellor with designing and conducting a series of activities to test interest in instructional development, to encourage that interest where it was found to exist and to stimulate interest where it seemed to be lacking. Projects of the committee have included assisting with "teaching tips" conferences, piloting a consulting service, producing a set of critical readings and organizing a "residential" conference.

The four "teaching tips" conferences, which the committee helped to publicize and finance, were located in different regions of Ohio and attended by a total of more than 600 faculty members. The consulting service project was initiated following a survey of the needs for consulting assistance in instructional development; during two and a half months, 38 institutions requested such services. A comprehensive two-volume set of readings in teaching was organized and edited by a subcommittee in information-sharing for controlled distribution to faculty members throughout the state. Requests for *Teaching in Higher Education: Critical Readings* have far outstripped supply and a new edition is being prepared for publication in 1977. The three-day "residential" conference was organized in the summer of 1975 to assist small teams of faculty members and administrators in planning programs to improve teaching on their own campuses. Twelve teams, selected on the basis of their proposals for instructional development, could be accommodated at this conference; more than 40 proposals were submitted by teams from 30 institutions.

During 1975-76 CACID organized, adopted and submitted a set of proposed recommendations on promoting professional development in teaching for the 1976-81 Master Plan for Higher Education; cosponsored and/or publicized five regional conferences on collegiate teaching; organized a training conference to assist several new institutional teams to plan for professional development programming; reviewed the progress of similar teams who had attended the first training conference in 1975; began a systematic effort for publicizing the concept of professional development in teaching and its own efforts on behalf of improved teaching and learning; and secured a $50,000 grant from a private foundation to underwrite its work.

During 1976-77 the committee began by inaugurating the Ohio Instructional Developers' conference, attracting over 100 professional development members interested in an active network to help one another. The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development was given and took the responsibility for drafting the implementation workplan for the 1976-81 Ohio Master Plan's chapter on "Quality Education." With access to one-half time of the Education Policy Fellow at the Ohio Board of Regents, CACID has been able to cosponsor or sponsor regional activities, teaching tips conferences, and a third annual residential conference for residential teams to develop implementable professional development in teaching programs on their

campuses. Further, nine institutions were provided individual consultants, 34 institutions are part of an ongoing research study to determine the effectiveness of the residential conferences, and the two volumes of critical readings are in process of being combined into a book.

Though much remains to be done, CACID has accomplished several important objectives. It has helped strengthen institutional support for the concept of professional development in teaching. It has demonstrated that a statewide effort can be effective in assisting instructional improvement across the public-private boundaries of higher education. It has established the credibility of the notion that the state may have a constructive role to play in instructional improvement.

In 1977, the committee is seeking to broaden the information network for improving instruction in Ohio. Representatives are available to meet with interested groups and individuals. Those who wish to be added to the mailing list of the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development, to receive more information about specific programs mentioned above, or to suggest additional resources or activities for improving instruction, should write to:

Chancellor's Advisory Committee
On Instructional Development
Ohio Board of Regents
30 East Broad Street, 36th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Those who have served on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development and its predecessor, the Conference Planning Committee, represent the range of institutional programs for improving teaching in Ohio. A current list of those persons serving on the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Industrial Development is available by writing the Ohio Board of Regents.

Sandra Cheldelin Inglis
Project Director of Instructional Development
Ohio Board of Regents
Columbus, OH 43215

Stephen C. Scholl
Dean of Educational Services
Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, OH 43015

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT: A VIEW FROM (NEAR) THE TOP

Harold H. Brown

The position of vice president for education, dean of instruction, or any other name which labels the chief academic officer affords the person occupying that position an unparalleled view of the academic realities. From this vantage point I have been able to survey the total problem in terms of needs generated by students, faculty, curriculum and organization.

To understand the rationale for developing a faculty development program, I looked beyond the teaching faculty and brought into focus all forces which impinge upon the instructional process. To do otherwise would seriously restrict the understanding of the full scope of what needs exist and the formulation of a systematic process to deal with those needs. How many times have I heard the faculty remark, "I've got the best group of students I've ever had. The best I can do for them is to stay out of the way and let them go." Or, I

have heard the opposite view, "I have an impossible group of students. I'll be lucky to get anyone through." The reality of these two completely different situations is that they represent a common problem for the instructor--a challenge which can be exciting in both cases. It will require the instructor to dig deep into his bag of alternative teaching strategies, if he possesses such a bag, and produce a set of classroom maneuvers that will effectively deal with classroom problems. Another consideration is that department which has an excellent hard-working instructional staff but also has the highest attrition rate in the division. It could be because of an outdated curriculum: Has it had thorough review in the past several years; and has it lost its relevance? It also could be the students: Do they compare with the students of a few years ago, or are they a new kind of student with a different set of needs?

Then there are always the problems generated by an organizational structure: Is it insensitive, rigid, more concerned about dollars than quality; does it understand or appreciate the problems of the department?

As defined by the Berquist and Phillips model, faculty development is instructional, personal and organizational development. I am suggesting that the thought of designing a faculty development program should be followed by such questions as: For what purpose? What kind of program? What problems should the program address? The answers to these questions, which should serve to help fashion the most effective kind of faculty development program, can be found by critically examining the four primary components: students, faculty, curriculum and organization.

STUDENTS

In the early sixties, a new kind of educational opportunity began sprouting in Ohio. It was the two-year college which aspired to be many things to many people. It operated under an open door policy and invited all people who were seeking a career, needing upgraded in present skills, retraining in new skills, or simply seeking to come in and try. Whatever the reason, these schools experienced a large number of students who accepted the invitation. Many of the two-year colleges found themselves with a growing student population. Concomitant with increasing student population, other significant changes developed and/or are now developing:

1. There has been a significant decrease in the percentage of new high school graduates (18-21 years old) in the student population.
2. The average age of the student body has risen from approximately 21 years to about 27 years.
3. The percentage of increase in full-time enrollments lags far behind the percentage increase in part-time enrollment.
4. The minority, disadvantaged and handicapped student population has increased significantly.
5. A vast majority of the student body is employed in some capacity for various numbers of hours per week.
6. There is a greater disparity in the academic backgrounds of the student body.
7. An increasing number of students will require extensive upgrading of basic academic skills through developmental courses prior to entering technology programs. Many of these same students will need various amounts of tutoring throughout their two-year program.

What this means is that the two-year colleges no longer have a student body which is dominated by the traditional recent high school graduate. The major segment of the student body is young adult, probably married with children or other responsibilities. He/she is in school on a part-time basis and is employed either full or part time. In many cases this student has had minimal success in high school some years ago. His educational and occupational goals are set and he knows the direction in which he is headed, and is committed to achieving these goals even though it might mean sacrifices and delayed gratification.

He/she represents the new non-traditional student and brings with him an uncommon set of characteristics and behaviors. Perhaps most important among these characteristics is the diversity in learning styles. Adding to this list the disadvantaged, and the handicapped -- all with very special needs, it is easy to perceive the immensity of the forces impacting on the teaching/learning process which must be dealt with if the two-year colleges are to provide meaningful educational experiences for all students.

FACULTY

To believe that diversity is an exclusive characteristic prevalent only among students and not among faculty is to believe a myth. Most technical instructors are practitioners recruited from their professional field to become teachers. They are well trained, highly competent and possess a strong background of technical experiences. Few of these people, however, have had the benefit of formal preparation for teaching or have informally acquired any classroom management skills prior to accepting teaching employment. Some bring with them vague notions of what teaching is about which is usually based on the kind of experiences they had as students. They have little understanding of the kinds of students they will encounter in the classroom or how to deal with these students and their problems. The two-year colleges have too often assumed that people having high levels of competence in the discipline are, ipso facto, teachers. For the most part, these persons are dispensers of knowledge rather than classroom manager. They tend to think of themselves first as practitioners and secondly as teachers, which only compounds the problem. Schools in general do not enjoy great success in providing positive learning experiences if this is measured by retention. That the attrition is no higher is a tribute to the resourcefulness of the students. The students somehow learn the rules of the game and what it takes to negotiate overcoming barriers established by faculty.

Having indicted the instructional faculty, I hasten to add that many of the faculty, through hard work and much effort, teach themselves to be teachers. This occurs with various degrees of success. The tragedy is that what success is obtained as teachers cannot be attributed to supportive and continuous in-service training provided by the college that employed them. Perhaps one of the greatest oddities in two-year colleges is that as experts in teaching and knowing its great value, the two-year colleges place such little emphasis on teaching teachers.

CURRICULUM

My use of the term "curriculum" is in the broadest sense -- to include curriculum courses, conditions of learning and educational technology.

It is my opinion that even outstanding faculty members cannot overcome the detrimental effects of poor curriculum. Unless there is a periodic systematic review of programs to insure relevance, and latest state of the arts, obsolescence is inevitable. This presumes that at one time there existed a viable program which is often not the case. In too many instances, learning objectives are not stated in clear, specific and measurable terms. So, how can teacher and students know what task and level of performance is expected of them. This

would also make the task of student assessment and evaluation near impossible.

In our two-year programs the two-year colleges are faced with a particularly difficult task. Two years is so short a period of time to bring the student to the level of competence required for employability. This places an increased burden on curriculum development. It means that every course must be designed so that the objectives, learning experiences and student evaluations are consistent -- complement, and support the overall objectives of the program. This is the first step for insuring the most effective courses and total program.

A necessary second step (not in order of priority) is to improve the efficiency of the learning process by introducing and maximizing the use of educational technology. And finally as stated by Gaff (1975), "There should be a manipulation of the conditions of learning, including carefully delineating the specific learning tasks required to grasp a body of knowledge, sequencing the tasks, making certain that students master elementary learning before they proceed to more advanced levels."

ORGANIZATION

The organizational structure and institutional goals and objectives play a dominate role in determining the nature and dimension of the faculty development program that will emerge on campus. Every functional unit in the college occupies some position within the organizational structure. The assignment of the development program within the organization will determine the level of support, commitment, influence and prestige it can reasonably expect. There are few things that can happen successfully in the college without the support of the president and chief academic officer. Therefore, it would seem advisable that a new emerging faculty development program should be placed under the direct protection of the chief academic officer. In this position there is reasonable insurance that the program will receive proper attention and high priority for institutional funds.

With regard to programming activities, if the organizational structure is such that departments and/or divisions are rigid and inflexible with high autonomy, then the faculty development program will be strongly influenced by these units to the extent that little or no support may be forthcoming at this level because of apprehension of infringement into departmental affairs.

All activities of the college should be designed and directed toward the support and achievement of the institution's goals and objectives. It is essential therefore that these goals and objectives be clearly articulated, understood and accepted by all functional units. The faculty development program must be considered within this frame of reference and must structure its activities accordingly.

This has been an attempt to look at faculty development in terms of the sources of four major forces which impact on the teaching/learning process and generate the need for development programs. It was assumed that a development program would have a positive effect on the improvement of instructors. It is reasonable to claim that of all the factors which affect the quality of education, none has greater influence on the teaching/learning process than the quality of the faculty and staff.

If changes are to occur, the two-year colleges must reorder their priorities and begin to pay more attention to the needs of faculty -- their most valuable resource.

Harold H. Brown
Vice President for Education
Columbus Technical Institute
Columbus, OH 43215

ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Walter Sikes

Faculty development is often subdivided into categories of (1) instructional development, (2) personal development, and (3) organizational development. Instructional development includes such activities as course and curriculum planning, classroom diagnosis, individualizing instruction, uses of media, and small group processes. Personal development is the rubric under which fall growth plans or contracts, life and career planning, interpersonal and group skills, awareness building, assertiveness training, and dealing with stress, among other things. The third leg of faculty development, organizational development, is the segment with which this article will primarily deal.

The label, "organizational development," is applied to a wide variety of activities--some of which are quite different in style and method from each other. Therefore, the term lacks precision. In general, however, OD is used to identify efforts to improve the peformance of organizations by application of behavioral science skills and knowledge. Although the focus of OD is on the enhancement of the organization's ability to achieve its goals, the philosophy of OD holds that the human relations in the organization should also be improved as a result of the OD effort. The OD process almost always includes some variation of the following: collection of data about the organization (the organization may be a unit of a larger organization such as a department, a staff group, a task force, etc.), which is then analyzed according to some organizational model. For instance, interviews may be conducted and the comments catagorized according to whether they relate to clarity and acceptance of purposes, structures and procedures, relationships, rewards, or leadership. The data are then reported to an appropriate group in the organization and key problems are identified. A problem solving process is then begun to deal with high priority issues. Actions must be tailored to fit the particular needs and history of the organization. They might include a goal clarifying process, redesigning of the physical environment, improving planning procedures, changing financial management and control methods, dealing with conflicts and differences, role clarification, problem solving, skill development, addressing interpersonal problems, restructuring jobs, redesigning the work flow, improving committee functioning, examining governance structures, and changing formal or informal rewards. Finally, an OD approach usually includes an evaluation to determine if the actions which have been taken have had the desired results.

This OD process was developed for the most part for application to business enterprises, although it has been in recent years employed by large numbers of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

health care systems, community organizations, and government agencies. The process has not been widely applied in higher education, although it has been used to good effect in a number of institutions. However, modifications need to be made in transferring the OD method from business to higher education. I have observed frequent, unfortunate consequences from consultants who have tried to work with educational institutions without sufficient knowledge of the differences between them and business organizations. For instance, the assumptions one makes in intervening in a business about goal clarity, about commitment to organizational purposes, about authority and power relations, about governance structures, and about measurability of outcomes frequently do not apply in the same way to a college. Goals tend to be more complex and varied, authority more diffuse, and results difficult to determine. These differences mean that strategies for applying OD to higher education must be particularly designed for its organizations. Typically, for instance, the mandate for the change effort needs to be more broadly based among members of a college than it needs to be in a business. Similarly, the relatively high degree of autonomy of faculty members and departments in many colleges and universities must be taken into account.

OD efforts often, although not always, involve a consultant (or a team of consultants) who are external to the organization. It is helpful to have these outside "change agents" for several reasons. They can bring skill and experience in organizational diagnosis, in planning for change, carrying out change-oriented activities, and in evaluating outcomes. They can provide useful knowledge from research or the experiences of other institutions. They can often identify problems to which those closer to the institution have become insensitive. Finally, they can confront situations or persons which it is difficult for on-going members of the organization to deal with because of power relations or the constraints of daily associations.

An institution can, however, engage in many OD activities without employing an outside consultant. An individual, or, even better, a group can conduct interviews or administer a questionnaire, organize and feed back the results, identify problems, and set up strategies for corrective actions. Many organizations have determined that an ideal approach to institutional improvement is to have an internal group with which an outside person periodically consults. Such teams typically have an exciting learning and growth experience in addition to whatever institutional problems they solve.

OD methodology can be a significant asset in these times when educational institutions must be more clear about their purposes, efficient in the use of resources, creative in responding to changing conditions, and supportive in dealing with their members. This approach to institutional renewal can at the least make colleges more effective organizations and more satisfying places to live and work. In some cases, it may indeed provide the key to survival.

Walter Sikes, Director
Center of Creative Change
Yellow Springs, OH 45387

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OATYC FOCUS
on
THE WAYNE GENERAL AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

John G. Hedrick

Each edition of the JOURNAL allows the reader to visit an Ohio two-year campus. This time the reader tours the scenic, rural Wayne General and Technical College of Orrville, Ohio.

The Wayne General and Technical College, located just a mile north of Orrville in Wayne County, is both a branch of and one of the degree-granting colleges of The University of Akron.

Admitting its first full class in Fall Quarter, 1972, the College has experienced an enrollment growth from 472 students that year to 810 students in Fall Quarter, 1977.

Located on 163 acres of beautiful farm country, Wayne College offers associate degree programs in secretarial science, mechanical technology, and electronic technology. The majority of students, however, are enrolled in the College's excellent transfer program, which comprises about eighty percent of the College's academic program. Its association with The University of Akron has enabled Wayne College to serve as the focal point for education workshops that serve the needs of educators in the area.

The College's population reflects a nationwide trend, with more and more non-traditional students enrolling each year. The median age of the student body is now 26.5, or almost what the median age of many evening colleges at major universities was just a few short years ago. Furthermore, the number of women returning to colleges and universities across the country is also reflected in the population mix at Wayne College where, for the first time this past Spring Quarter, women outnumbered men at the school. This statistic is in sharp contrast to the enrollment pattern in the College's first year, when men outnumbered women by a two-to-one margin.

While the College primarily serves three counties, Wayne, Holmes, and Medina, the majority of students are from Wayne County.

The large number of students who successfully transfer and complete their course of studies at other universities and colleges bear testimony to the high quality of academic preparation during the first two years at Wayne College. The president of the 1977 graduating class at The University of Akron, for example, began his studies at Wayne College before transferring to the main campus. One of the top engineering students at The University of Akron took all of his basic studies at Wayne College before being admitted to the College of Engineering.

In addition to the curricular program, Wayne College has been able to provide many excellent excurricular activities for students, most of whom have jobs in addition to their academic programs. An active Student Senate has successfully prompted dances, workshops, and encouraged the formation of many student clubs, from math to chess to drama. The College is represented athletically on the two-year college scene by a men's basketball team, and among local athletics by a women's softball team and a men's softball team.

Wayne College was accredited by North Central in 1976 after an extensive and intensive self-study conducted by the faculty, students, and administration of the College. Currently the College is re-evaluating its programs with hopes of being able to add associate-degree programs that will continue to meet the needs of an ever-expanding student population and to meet the needs of the many diverse business and industries in its service area.

In all that it does, Wayne College attempts to live by a slogan that has become its hallmark, "Your Future is Our Present."

Dean John C. Hedrick
The Wayne General and Technical College
10470 Smucker Road
Orrville, OH 44667
Phone [216] 683-2010

PRACTICUM

TEAMING . . . THE ROAD TO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AT CLARK TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Albert A. Salerno

Dean Albert A. Salerno originally delivered the following article as a paper for the Conference on Instructional and Professional Development at Stark Technical College, May 21, 1977. He has obliged the JOURNAL and permitted it to share this well-conceived and highly successful Clark Tech practicum.

Jerry Gaff, in his latest book titled TOWARD FACULTY RENEWAL, defines faculty development as" . . . enhancing the talents, expanding the interests, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their roles as teachers."

This task, defined by Gaff and others, is indeed one which takes the full cooperation of all elements of the college community. No faculty member, no administrator, no support person, nor any president can consider himself unattached to the concept if it is to succeed on the campus.

If "teaching and learning" is what our business is all *about*, then we must begin to recognize the need for institutions to facilitate the process. Next to students our faculties are the most important resource which we have to offer our constituent communities. If they are indeed a most important resource, then we need to begin to care for them and to facilitate their professional growth . . . yes, to accept them as both professionals and human beings. It is only in this way that we can begin to reap the benefits, in terms of learning outcomes, for our clients (students). An adequate teaching environment and a personal growth structure would go a long way in increasing the amount of learning which takes place in the classroom.

John F. Noonan (1972; 1974), Nevitt Sanford (1971), John M. Bevan (1974) and Jerry Gaff (1975) have written about the objectives of a system for professional development. I believe a continuing program at Clark Technical College is gradually moving in the direction of these major premises. They are:

"Instruction is the primary role of most faculty members, but instructional quality is affected by their performance in other roles, such as research, committee work, and community involvement. Faculty should be encouraged to grow in these areas."

"Teaching makes demands on the whole personality of the instructor . . . programs that seek to improve instruction will have more impact if they emphasize a wide range of attitudes, values, skills, and sensitivities concerning teaching and learning than if they focus on a narrow concern -- for instance, on classroom techniques."

"When offered opportunities to improve their performance, substantial number of faculty will accept the offer."

"For significant and lasting change in a teacher to occur, his emotions and affections must be engaged as well as his ideas and cognition."

"Change in an individual requires a challenge to his habit patterns, one strong enough to stimulate new forms of behavior, but not so strong to overwhelm him."

"Faculty members will change when: (a) they have knowledge about alternative ways of behaving, (b) they have the belief that change is desirable, (c) they believe they can change in the desired ways, (d) they receive non-threatening feedback about their own behavior, (e) they are praised, recognized, and rewarded for effectiveness and improvement. For faculty, this means the reward structure must recognize their development efforts or they will not strive for improvement."

"All faculty members, regardless of age, experience, or effectiveness, can develop in many ways. Faculty development is not a remedial concept for poor teachers or under achievers."

"Each faculty contains many persons with expertise that can be used in a faculty development program. These persons should be identified and encouraged to share their perspective and expertise with their colleagues."

"Because faculty are part of social groups, it is often important to work with whole departments, colleges, or other units in order to improve the climate for teaching. This often means working with administrators as well as faculty and may involve altering institutional policies or procedures."

"Not every faculty member needs to be involved in any one program for it to

be successful . . . a program may operate most effectively if it starts with those few persons with the most interest and only later involves those who initially were less enthusiastic."

The last premise was our foundation for planning the professional development program at Clark Technical College. During the 1974-75 academic year, an "Instructional Development Group" (ID Group) began to meet on campus. This loosely knit group of faculty/administrators was pulled together by Tom McCuistion, the director of Instructional Services at CTC. The ID Group began to meet monthly at faculty homes to discuss any topics in professional development anyone cared to introduce. Gradually they became the nucleus for our ID Group of 19 persons who presently comprise our "Instructional Development Team." Thus, we used a small concentration of interested faculty to educate other faculty members on professional development.

Until our ID team began looking at the teaching/learning equation from a faculty perspective, we had made all of the basic mistakes in plotting a professional development program.

A. We used seminar days for faculty, but topics were decided upon in an administrative manner . . . topics fit institutional goals defined by the Dean's office and not by faculty definition of worth.

B. Since our program was regimented, *all* faculty attended *all* sessions. It's easier to administer that way.

C. Faculty were treated to such seminars as "Micro-teaching as a Device for Self-Evaluation," "Porta-Pak Instructional Films," "A.V. Workshop" and other hardware oriented workshops under the guise of "professional development."

D. We didn't realize some faculty would naturally resent a program to "improve" or "change" them. They frequently asked about "change" and why "*you* simply couldn't improve upon *your* base" . . . why did innovation always seem to mean a drastic and complete change in method, attitude and structure?

Our concept for providing a "faculty development" model began to change in 1974. In December of that year, we offered two workshops for faculty. One was on "Constructing Behavioral Objectives" and the other was "Test Construction and Validation." Clark Technical College faculty, with expertise in these areas, planned and operated the two workshops. Our evaluations showed that faculty acceptance was high and that faculty were enthusiastic about the topics.

During 1974, we also instituted a program of faculty grants for innovative program or projects. A grant for $800 was awarded to two faculty members to plan and operate a Communications I course on the Keller or PSI model. That experiment was extended for two quarters in order to produce more reliable data. As of this date we have adopted the PSI model and will offer one-third of our first-year communications students the opportunity to earn credit through the mastery learning model.

Capping our progress in 1974 was the creation of a faculty/administrative team which attended the Ohio Wesleyan conference; it was sponsored by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Instructional Development. Our professional development team planned activities for an entire year . . . in July of 1975, they met to present the plan to CTC's President R.O. Brinkman. President Brinkman's support was immediately forthcoming and the team launched the following activities:

A. A summer retreat was held at a local country club for some 19 invited key faculty and their wives. The year-long plan for professional development was aired and they were asked to become a part of the effort.

B. This nucleus of 19 people was invited to a two-day residential workshop in early September at the Dayton Bergamo Center. Topics such as "Alternative Teaching Strategies," "How to Conduct Committee Meetings," "How to Lead Discussions in the Classroom," and several others were explored. Another focal point of the conference was "interviewing skills." One session was devoted to the interview process planned for a local needs assessment survey.

C. In December a similar workshop (with a different outside consultant) was held for all faculty. In essence the same kind of focus on student-learning styles and faculty-teaching styles was evident. Our evaluations indicated an acceptance of the workshop by faculty and an advisory evaluation in March showed some faculty change.

D. We have committed over $10,000 for faculty conferences and travel. During 1975-76, over 50 workshops (exclusive of Bergamo or in house) have been attended by faculty and department chairpersons. Over 30 different faculty have been in attendance out of a professional staff of 60. These figures represent our efforts up to mid-April of 1976 . . . we will probably increase these numbers by 10% between now and June.

E. In March of 1975, we began a "needs assessment" survey of all faculty. Once again the focal point was professional development and what we could do institutionally to meet some of these needs. Our survey should be completed by June and will serve as a data base for team planning for 1976-77. Each team member personally interviewed 3 peers and wrote a narrative on each interview.

F. Our original plan called for several mini-workshops by faculty during the course of the year. We did have several mini-workshops on A.V. materials, readability formulas, etc., during this past academic year.

G. The faculty redefined the major criteria for "merit" evaluation and re-employment during this past year. Clark has a non-cumulative merit system for its faculty. The areas agreed upon were "Teaching Performance"/65 percent, "Faculty Service"/20 percent, and "Faculty Professional Growth"/15 percent. Values assigned in the system will be re-evaluated on a year by year basis.

H. The Instructional Services Department has instituted a faculty professional library in our LRC. Professional books, periodicals, and tapes are available for faculty use. Catalogs of films, teaching methods, and devices are also housed in this area.

The success or failure of our present effort will take several more years to adequately evaluate. However, we are most pleased with the progress of our "team" effort and the potential that we see in its proper utilization. Faculty development or professional development is an integral part of the academic process at Clark Technical College. Our faculty, administration, and staff are committed to its continuance.

As a postscript you might think about professional development on your campus in relation to Jerry Gaff's major premises, which I earlier outlined, or the following ideas regarding the teaching/learning equation. They point to our need for alternative methods of teaching and/or learning.

A. Learning arises from interaction between the student and various symbols.

B. Self-initiated learning is more likely to be lasting learning.

C. No one learning process can provide outcome better than another learning process.

D. Learners differ in readiness, attitudes and the ability for learning.

E. The institution as a whole educates . . . faculty alone does not educate.
F. Real difference between an adequate and a great teacher does exist and shows in learning outcomes.
G. The concept that a teacher has of his role will affect his teaching.
H. The effective college teacher seems to have the following characteristics:
He is an expert in his field.
He is constantly growing professionally.
He is not narrow in perspective.
And, he believes in the development of the students.
I. Teaching is an activity which increases the potentiality of students.

Albert A. Selerno
Dean of Instruction
Clark Technical College
Springfield, OH 45505

FORUM

ISSUE: SHOULD THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS PROVIDE CATEGORICAL FUNDING FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS?

The JOURNAL's "Forum" examines the issues involved in the direct support, the providing of funds, for faculty development by the Ohio Board of Regents. Responding to this issue are Mr. Charles Warman, Cincinnati Technical College and Dr. Edward Florak, Jefferson County Technical Institute.

WHY I OPPOSE CATEGORICAL FUNDING

Charles Warman

I oppose categorical funding by the Board of Regents of faculty development efforts for the following reasons:

The amount of subsidy money available for all purposes in the current biennium will be insufficient to meet all of the needs of all of the state-assisted institutions. Categorical funding is not possible as a practical matter in this biennium without a reduction of the amount of subsidy money available for FTE's enrolled at the various institutions. Categorical funding under the circumstances would be a mere bookkeeping function. Some institutions conceivably would get a greater gross income with categorical funding for faculty development and a reduced FTE subsidy than they would with FTE funding alone, while others would get less.

Aside from the practical aspect there is a danger in the establishment of categorical funding as a principle. Each instance of categorical funding represents a diminution of a responsibility of autonomous institutions for the development of budgetary priorities. Some institutions need to spend more for

faculty development than could be obtained through categorical funding and others, less.

Each institution should be responsible for determining how much money of the funds available to it should be spent for whatever purposes. Categorical funding implicitly suggests that institutions: (a) cannot responsibly establish budgetary priorities, (b) will not set aside funds for faculty development programs, and (c) cannot calculate the amount of money which they ought to invest in this important effort.

I am confident that the leadership of each state-assisted institution is capable of making all of these administrative judgments. I believe that general funding--i.e., FTE subsidy--is the most effective funding approach that can be employed by the Board of Regents.

If FTE subsidy funds are inadequate--and I am sure many of us would agree that they are--then we ought to invest our efforts in increasing the FTE subsity rate. Categorical funding is not the answer to this problem.

Charles Warman
Vice President of Community Services
and Community Relations
Cincinnati Technical College
Cincinnati, OH 45223

CATEGORICAL FUNDING CAN BE AN ASSET

Edward Florak

In examining the issue of whether Institutions of Higher Education should receive categorical funding to support a Staff Development Program, one assumption must be stated. Faculty development is necessary in order for people engaged in the profession of teaching to continue their professional and personal growth. This growth is a necessary response to the concept of accountability. It appears that this concept will be more prevalent in the 1980's than it has been in the 1970's.

My main concern is with the many small institutions that have had a history of difficulty responding to the demands placed on them in such programs as Affirmative Action and Developmental Education. With limited resources smaller institutions usually utilize existing personnel to do what they can to comply with demands of laws and agencies. However, their programs are usually limited in scope and designed to meet minimum standards.

Categorical funding would give the smaller schools a designated sum of money to support a specific program. In faculty development this money would be identified exclusively for a special program. These funds could be used to develop and promote activities related to the improving of faculty skills, personal development or effect organizational change.

However, categorical funds may not be used in the most efficient and effective fashion by the institution if a person on campus is designated to manage the program. Their experience in this area may be too limited. Without in-depth knowledge or skill, the strategy may be to channel the money and activity into areas of skill development such as workshops or topics as "How to Teach," or "The Effect of Audiovisual Aids in Instruction." Activities and programs devoted to organizational development (team building etc.) and personal development may be neglected because the staff person lacks the experience and competence to work in these areas.

Categorical funding can be a real asset for small institutions which lack the resources to develop a program from their own assets, if that money is used to hire staff specialist and provide financial resources for a comprehensive program. There should be some guidelines and directions provided so that the funds can be used to the benefit of the faculty, students, and the institution.

Edward Florak
Vice President of Academic Affairs
Jefferson Technical College
Steubenville, OH 43952

PLUS ONE

SELECTING THE RIGHT CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Carol Zion and Suzanne Richter

The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges of Washington, D.C., has graciously consented to the reprinting of the very pertinent article, "Selecting the Right Criteria for Evaluation" [COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGE JOURNAL, November 1973] as the JOURNAL's first "Plus One" feature.

With increased emphasis on accountability, a major problem for educational management is establishing criteria and a process for staff evaluation -- evaluation that is meaningful, specific, workable, mutual, and humane.

For the individual, evaluation should serve as a strength assessment. It sould indicate directions for professional growth, and it should provide a support base for achieving that growth.

Planning Material

For the organization, evaluation should serve as material for long-range program and staff planning. It should relate directly to the institutional objective, and it sould contribute to team building. By providing an evaluation process that stresses educational leadership, resource utilization, and institutional goals, one meets the needs of the individual and the organization.

The process we are suggesting is applicable to all members of the staff: teaching, faculty, librarians, counselors, administrators, secretaries, etc. It personalizes the evaluation procedure by eliminating the single form or checklist that in its generality rarely has meaning for specific individuals or captures the contributions of diverse areas.

Basically, the process has two parts: (1) stating the major strengths of the person being evaluated, and (2) establishing professional goals.

Under the heading, "Major Strengths," the abilities that the individual has demonstrated and his contributions to the organization are listed. Beginning the evaluation with this positive step serves two basic purposes: (1) the person evaluating must focus on the contributing aspects of the individual, and (2) the person being evaluated realizes that his assets and strengths are being recognized and recorded. This process of strength assessment provides him

with the time and opportunity for professional introspection; he must rethink and verbalize both his career assets and his positive contributions to the organization.

After listing strengths, the next step is to design professional goals with emphasis on three basic areas:

1. Proposed institutional utilization of strengths. For example, if a person has skills in group work, one of his goals should specify areas in which the organization can maximally utilize this strength.
2. Proposed institutional utilization of potential. An example would be a person's learning some entirely new skill that is in demand by the organization and for which the individual has demonstrated interest and aptitude.
3. Plan for professional improvement. This section would list specific skills needed by the individual to fulfill his job description and role. It must also contain the planned institutional support for accomplishing this development.

The format employed in this process should be adapted to be styles of the individuals involved. The evaluator and the person being evaluated may choose to talk together about the strengths as each perceives them and jointly write the professional goals. Or each separately may outline the strengths and goals and then meet to verbally share what they have written and agree on a final draft. A third choice is for the evaluator to list the strengths and goals and then present them to the individual who reads, reacts, disagrees, agrees. The choice of format will usually depend on the relationship between the staff members involved; in any case, the format should be comfortable for both people.

Whatever is selected, the individual being evaluated has the right to contribute, add, adapt, and suggest strengths and goals that the evaluator may simply not know or has overlooked.

While the stating of objectives renders the evaluation specific and, to an extent, measureable, it is the personalized strength assessment that keeps it humane. Too often, evaluations either concentrate on the negative, glossing over or ignoring contributions, or they glow in tribute without offering growth suggestions. This polarization stems from the traditional uses of evaluation: to fire or promote the person. However, if evaluation is viewed as feedback, it becomes a mechanism for achieving individual and organization objectives.

The result of this process becomes in fact a contract. Each knows which of his personal or organizational responsibilities will guarantee the achievement of the staff member's goals -- an achievement of mutual benefit to the individual and the organization.

Another advantage to this model of evaluation is the continuity -- last year's professional goals can become this year's strengths. If professional goals have not been fulfilled, then the reasons need to be analyzed. Perhaps the individual made no effort toward professional growth, or the area itself changed its priorities, or the institution did not provide the necessary support. The results of this analysis determine the action to be taken.

At Miami-Dade Community College-North, this evaluation process is being used to reinforce the practical aspects of management by objectives for an educational institution. For any area that has clearly defined objectives, this process diminishes the subjective factor in staff evaluation. As a planning tool, compiling all the major strengths from individual evaluations in any specific area furnishes an overview of the resources available for program development. Analyzing this compilation for missing strengths yields a profile for hiring new staff and training current staff.

Most importantly, at North Campus, evaluation is part of a total program of

staff and organization development that provides institutional support for achieving professional goals. Support is given in the form of sabbaticals, short-term study leaves, released time for planning and training, internal and external consultant help, and on-campus workshops. While resources for support are allocated based upon the goals and objectives of the institution, an attempt is made to capitalize on the unique talents and professionalism of each member of the organization. The staff development program, like the evaluation format, is an interactive process where individuals explore beneficial relationships to the total organization and each other.

The office of staff development has introduced this evaluation process in a group setting for team building. The area head (division director) and his department chairmen learn the process and its advantages. Then the division director is evaluated by the dean; he, in turn, evaluates his department chairmen. After experiencing the evaluation individually, they come back as a team to discuss their reaction.

At this point, the department chairmen adapt the process to their individual styles before introducing it to the faculty.

After necessary team building, this process lends itself to staff evaluating their line administrator and peers evaluating each other. When the process is reversed, i.e., staff of an administrator, the evaluation preferably should be a group rather than an individual evaluation. This gives the administrator an overview of his management strengths and goals rather than a series of individual opinions. For example, if ten division directors are evaluating the dean, group evaluation becomes more open and a learning situation. If one division director lists as a professional goal for the dean that he be more responsive to input from subordinates, but the other nine have responsiveness as a strength, then the problem is with that one division director rather than with the management effectiveness of the dean. These same advantages and opportunities for growth exist in peer evaluation.

VARYING STAGES

At Miami-Dade Community College-North, implementation of this evaluation process is in varying stages. Some areas have advanced to staff evaluating their line administrator; others are just beginning with department chairmen evaluating faculty.

However, this mutual and practical application of management by objectives to evaluation, supported by the administration and an active staff development program is working on all levels with the emerging realization that evaluation can be positive, growth oriented, and humane.

Carol Zion
Director of Management
and Organization Division
Miami Dade Community College
Miami, FL 33156

Suzanne Richter
Assistant Dean
Miami Dade Community College
Miami, FL 33156

FACULTY EVALUATION IN AN ACCOUNTABLE WORLD: HOW DO YOU DO IT?

Clare Rose

The JOURNAL's second "Plus One" feature is Clare Rose's provacative and on-target article - an enlightening appraisal of the methods and a challenging discussion of the role of evaluation in faculty development [a lead position paper presented to the March 1977 AAHE Conference in Chicago].

Every year vast numbers of faculty members are "evaluated," and major decisions affecting their lives and the lives of their students are made on the basis of inaccurate, unreliable, inferential, subjective and unsystematically collected information. On paper, particularly at large universities, faculty are evaluated in three areas--research, community service and teaching. In reality, we all know that "publish or perish" prevails in the trinity. We hear that the majority of administrators at liberal arts colleges are themselves satisfied and believe that their faculty are satisfied with the policies and practices used for evaluation. In fact, we know that this is not true. The majority of faculty evaluations at liberal arts colleges are based on chairmen and deans' subjective evaluations, and faculty look upon them much as a child forced to take cod liver oil--with suspicion and distaste.

If the audience detects a note of dissatisfaction in these statements, they are correct. I am appalled at the shoddy practices that characterize the "state-of-the-art." I am dismayed by the fact that many of the very same critics of faculty evaluation who argue that teaching cannot be assessed because it is too complex a process and that "really important learning" cannot be measured (an idea that survives without a shred of evidence), then accept evaluation procedures based on a generally haphazard collection of opinions from students, colleagues and administrators; and even more, accept almost uncritically important decisions based on inferences drawn from these opinions.

Certainly, I am not alone in my concern about faculty evaluation. Several of education's formidable gadflies have been arguing for systematic faculty evaluation procedures for over thirty years. In my mind, however, the progress we have made would astonish even the most cautious tortoise. During the last few years, as the accountability movement brought forth renewed interest in the quality of teaching and new demands for faculty evaluation, one would have thought that the rather obvious relationship between the two factors would have emerged as the foundation for a rigorous program of faculty evaluation. No such logic prevailed, and people continued their fruitless search for qualities and behaviors that define *the* perfect teacher. Hundreds of studies were designed to isolate an index of instructional skills, and almost without exception, all failed to yield even a hint.

In the meantime, we somehow lost our perspective about the function of our faculty and the real purpose of higher education. *We have lost our perspective about the dual purposes of faculty evaluation:* (1) to render judgments about an individual teacher's instructional effectiveness as part of his competence as a faculty member; but, even more important, (2) to provide faculty members with the means to improve their teaching. Faculty evaluation is not an end in itself. It is the means to improving instruction; to providing a better education for our students.

Let us suppose for a moment that a college or university was genuinely interested in establishing a judicious and effective faculty evaluation system. What should they do? Congruent with the title of this symposium, "Faculty evaluation in an accountable world: How do you do it?", we must first ask to whom is higher education accountable . . . and for what? For my part, there is little doubt. We are accountable to the students! And for what? unquestionably, high quality instruction.

If we accept that a high quality education is the basic mission of higher education, then the procedures used for evaluating faculty should *at least* include some evidence of a faculty member's ability to promote learning. *If learning is the goal, then a crucial element in the teacher evaluation process is the means whereby both student and teacher can determine whether the student has in fact learned what he was supposed to have learned.* Can the student analyze the problem, formulate hypotheses, solve the equation, translate the sentence, describe the imagery? Does the student demonstrate awareness and sensitivity, use critical thinking, love learning for learning's sake? If not, why not? What are the errors and why do they exist? The answers to these questions provide direction for the teacher *during* the instructional process and a more appropriate base for evaluating a person's teaching performance.

Regardless of the reliability, validity or any other statistical construct of the measurement being used, a faculty evaluation program must be considered a failure unless it contributes directly to the improvement of students' education. Assessing the competency of a faculty's teaching effectiveness *and* improving instruction, the two purposes of such evaluations, are both essential to the goals of higher education. It is difficult and, I believe, inadvisable to separate the two.

Leaving aside for a moment evaluation of research productivity and community service, what are the choices of evaluative data available and what are their advantages and disadvantages as far as their contribution to a judicious and systematic faculty evaluation system are concerned?

1. *Classroom visitation.* One of the most frequently used practices is that of classroom visitations. Whether they are undertaken by administrators or colleagues, formally or informally, classroom visitations do not yield reliable data and have little to recommend them. While it may be comforting to consult with a trusted colleague about an instructional problem or even the content to be presented, no one can adequately judge whether another person is or is not an effective teacher merely by watching. We all have our own perceptions of what constitutes effective teaching and our judgements of another's performance are biased by these perceptions.

2. *Self-evaluations.* Several institutions have drawn upon self-evaluation as an element in faculty evaluation. The limitations of this type of data are obvious--it is impossible to be totally objective about yourself. Studies of self-assessment have found that faculty tend to overrate themselves with respect to their overal effectiveness. At the same time, because they have received no training on how to focus on the really relevant aspects of their instruction, they criticize superficialities such as appearance, mannerisms and voice tone--none of which bear any significant relationship to either student satisfaction or achievement. Relationships investigated between self-evaluation ratings and other criteria, such as student ratings and measures of student gain, have been found to be negligible.

3. *Student ratings.* Without question, the evaluation measure most widely

employed today is the ubiquitous student rating questionnaire. Student ratings do have some merit. They are relatively easy to collect, provide a comparatively large data base, and even more important, provide a means for student input into the educational system (however superficial that may be).

That they are valid and reliable is supported by the research. But so is the fact that they are affected by such factors as class size, academic discipline, course content and faculty experience. To make promotion and tenure decisions on the basis of student opinion would result in serious injustices to the teachers of large classes or required courses in "tough" disciplines. Even more serious is the fact that there is simply no evidence to suggest that student ratings are effective aids for improving teaching.

To discover *post hoc* that students felt you didn't "stimulate them to high intellectual effort" gives little constructive feedback which can help you detect why you didn't and how you could do so in the future. On the other hand, finding that you "encouraged students to express themselves freely and openly" or "spoke with expressiveness and variety in your tone of voice" might lead you to join Actor's Equity, but tells you nothing about whether the students learned as a result of your vibrant tones.

Consumer satisfaction is certainly an important consideration in any evaluation scheme, and student ratings are reliable and valid indicators of students' *feelings* of satisfaction. But, as the Dr. Fox experiments amply demonstrated, student satisfaction with learning represents little more than the illusion of having learned. Inclusion of student ratings in an evaluation system must be done with this reality in mind.

4. *Criterion-referenced measurement.* Measuring change in student behavior toward explicitly defined educational objectives is a relatively new and most promising approach to faculty evaluation. Commonly referred to as criterion-referenced measurement, this system focuses on the knowledge, skills or attitudes students have acquired *as a result* of their instruction. Based on the assumption that effective teaching means promoting changes in student learning, criterion-referenced evaluation *directly* measures the teacher's impact on student learning.

Instead of identifying a student's relative status in the class (as in the traditional norm-referenced measurement system), attention is focused on the individual student and his changes in behavior--in other words, changes in his learning. The precise boundaries of the behavior to be assessed are defined and criteria for judging the adequacy of the student responses are identified prior to instruction. Thus, an absolute rather than a relative standard is used to measure learning.

Criterion levels can be established at any point during instruction where information concerning the level of an individual's performance is desired. The term "criterion" does not necessarily refer to final, end-of-the-course behavior. The point is that specific behaviors and attitudes implied at each level of proficiency are identified and used to describe the specific tasks a student must be capable of performing.

One of the chief problems with using criterion-referenced measurement, or its outgrowth (contract plans) for evaluating teaching, is that since different teachers set different goals within the same discipline, and often, even within the same course, it is difficult to compare the relative proficiency of teachers who are pursuing different goals with different groups of students. The adoption of such a process also requires the education of faculty and administrators so that they both know how to define explicit teaching goals, evaluate the worth

of the goals, and to construct the difficult, but absolutely necessary, appropriate criterion-referenced tests. Such an educational program is both expensive and time consuming.

The advantages of the system to my mind, however, outweigh its disadvantages. While the process is difficult and time-consuming, the payoff is well worth the effort. First of all, by defining specific objectives prior to instruction, the teacher can more likely employ relevant instructional materials that will help students attain the objectives. The process of specifically defining objectives forces instructors to carefully think through exactly what they really want to teach, and it is then much more likely that they will head for truly worthwhile goals. Secondly, students' progress toward attainment of the objectives can be continuously monitored so that instruction can be continuously improved *while* the course is still in progress, not after the fact. Finally, the criterion-referenced measurement system provides for a fairer evaluation of a faculty member's competence AS A TEACHER. There is a mass of evidence that no one style or method of teaching produces superior learning. The criterion-referenced measurement system takes this well-established but often forgotten fact into consideration. The faculty member whose students make progress toward and achieve educational goals *is* an effective teacher regardless of the methods he uses.

The evaluation of teaching is a far too serious and complicated process to be based solely on the personal assessment of administrators, the judgment of visiting peers, an examination of course syllabi or teaching methods, or especially student opinions. Each of these is useful, but none is sufficient by itself. They are not even that valuable in total. We must recognize the deficiencies in these traditional approaches, continue to explore and refine more direct measures of learner growth, and, until *the* perfect evaluation system is found, if ever, opt for multiple indicators of assessing faculty performance.

Clare Rose
President of Evaluation and
Training Institute
11110 Ohio Avenue, Suite 202
Los Angeles, CA 90025

REACTION

The JOURNAL encourages letters and articles of reaction to its content, its policies, and to the OATYC and its activities. The following responses comment on the OATYC Convention of 1977.

REACTION TO OATYC CONFERENCE – NOVEMBER 4 - 5, 1977

Charles Pressler

In my opinion, the strong points of the recent conference held at Wayne Technical College were discussions concerning the following areas of education:

1. Placement testing in communications and mathematics
2. Faculty development programs
3. Developmental education
4. Educational mal-practice
5. Cognitive mapping

I believe that attendance could be improved by publishing the conference agenda at least six weeks in advance.

Also, I would suggest that a concerted effort be made to combine the activities of the various organizations connected with two-year colleges. For example, on November 5, the Mathematics Association met in another city. Faculty rsponsibilities and tight budgets do not permit travel to several conferences a year.

In closing, I would like to commend the officers of the OATYC for providing a conference that, for the most part, was meaningful to all two-year college faculty members regardless of the technology.

Charles Pressler, Instructor
Business Technologies
Central Ohio Technical College
Newark, OH 43055

REACTION TO OATYC CONFERENCE – NOVEMBER 4 - 5, 1977

Michael P. Roetter

I attended the OATYC Conference as a member of the General Education Organization which held its meeting concurrently with the OATYC. The obvious reaction to the Conference is one of disappointment with respect to the low attendance. It is not sufficient though to simply complain that people did not show up and support the organization. Let's rather think of reasons why people may not have come. It is necessary to attempt to provide a motivating force to make people want to attend. As such, instead of reacting negatively I

would like to suggest the following ways to improve interest in the OATYC and its Conference.

1. Avoid overlap, if possible, with the other groups such as the American Tecnhical Education Association and the Ohio Vocational Association. There are problem areas unique to Ohio's two-year colleges. These should be considered and addressed. Locally implemented programs should be rationalized and described for consideration by other Ohio two-year college educators.

2. Increase the breadth of the various sessions and attempt to attract discipline oriented two-year college groups such as the Ohio Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges and the Business Educators Technical Association to meet concurrently with the OATYC to broaden its program. In certain areas of the past Conference's program there was a definite paucity of presentations.

3. Realizing of course that the Association no doubt lost money on the conference, attempt should be made to reduce the cost of the conference to its participants. It is a fact that many people simply could not attend because of sharply reduced college budgets.

Possibly some of the pleasantries enjoyed at prior conferences can be foregone. These may include a banquet served at a motel or hotel and, in fact, meeting at a hotel or motel. Possibly a full one day conference would be in order, with a lunch and banquet served at the host institution. Hotel or motel accommodations could be arranged at any number of local motels according to the strength of an individual's college budget. Meals therefore could be catered at a much lower cost. Exhibitors could be invited both to attract conference conferees and to help offset the cost of the conference itself.

4. A program published well in advance of the conference would be most helpful in drawing attention to the conference itself. It would be helpful, in fact, if presentors scheduled to speak at the conference could supply brief one paragraph descriptions of their presentations so that people likely to attend could better justify the time and expense of making the trip.

The above suggestions are intended to be constructive as opposed to critical. Despite the low attendance, though, it was a pleasure to renew some old acquaintances and make some new ones. The programs presented, although to small audiences, were good and presented by very knowledgeable people.

Michael P. Roetter
Division Director of General Education
The Michael J. Owens Technical College
Toledo, Ohio 43699

INFORMATION FOR PROSPECTIVE CONTRIBUTORS

The *Journal* encourages submission of material for any of its sections by faculty, staff, administrators and/or trustees of any of Ohio's community, general and technical, junior, regional and technical campuses. The *Journal* is particularly receptive to articles of general professional importance in the areas of administration, instruction, and baccalaureate or technical studies for two-year institutions.

There are fifty solicitors of editorial material listed here. Contact your campus solicitor or one nearest you to inquire about submitting a specific manuscript.

Manuscripts must be typed double-spaced and of approximately 1,000-3,000 words in length. All submissions must be accompanied by a stamped self-addressed envelope for return. Art work must be black and white. Photos glossy; tables and drawings on 8½x11 paper. The name and address of the contributor should be on the back of all art copy.

Editorial Policy:

The *Journal* is not responsible for manuscripts or materials lost in mailing nor is it responsible for returning items not accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope.

The *Journal* reserves the right to edit manuscripts to meet its needs and objectives. Where major revisions are necessary, every effort will be made to clear the changes with the author.

Submission deadline for the next *Journal* is March 1, 1978.

POLICY CHANGE

In order to more fully achieve the JOURNAL's objectives and fulfill its mission, the Editorial Board in its November 1977 meeting decided to publish one theme-oriented edition a year, inviting a guest on guest editors [if interested, contact us] to help develop a theme and to solicit the necessary manuscripts.

OATYC JOURNAL CAMPUS SOLICITORS

Agricultural Technical Institute, Dr. Dan Garrison
Belmont Technical College, Mr. Andrew Tobasci and Mr. Thomas Ostaeiewski
Bliss College, Mr. John Dodson
Bowling Green State University, Firelands Branch, Dr. M. Douglas Reed
Central Ohio Technical College, Ms. Beth Waggenspack
Cincinnati Technical College, Mr. Tim Nolan
Clark Technical College, Dr. Lloyd Monnin
Clermont General and Technical College, Dr. Edith Peters
Columbus Technical Institute, Ms. Lorita Langdon

Cuyahoga Community College East, Mr. Thomas Morris
Cuyahoga Community College Metro, Mr. Stanley Klosek
Cuyahoga Community College West, Mr. Richard D. Matthews
Edison State College, Ms. Marcie Foote
Hocking Technical College, Mr. R. L. Mitchell
Jefferson Technical Institute, Dr. Paul Michael
Kent State University, Ashtabula Campus, Dr. Jack E. Smith
Kent State University, East Liverpool Campus, Mr. Carl Yoke
Kent State University, Geauga Campus, Dr. Barry Aronson
Kent State University, Salem Campus, Mr. Joe Wendel
Kent State University, Tuscarawas Campus, Dr. Francis Hazard
Kent State University, Trumbull Campus, Ms. Valerie Dueker
Kettering College of Medical Arts, Dr. Winton Beavon and Dr. Lynn Foll
Lakeland Community College, Mr. Howard Erlechman
Lima Technical College, Mr. Alan Lange
Lorain County Community College, Mr. Steven Jonas
Lourdes College, Sister Beatrice
Marion Technical College, Mr. Richard Claflin
Miami-Jacobs Junior College of Business, Mr. Charles P. Harbottle
Michael J. Owens Technical College, Dr. David Miller
Muskingum Area Technical College, Ms. Catherine Cummings
North Central Technical College, Mr. Thurman Grass
Northwest Technical College, Dr. James Nagel
Ohio University, Belmont Campus, Ms. Liberty Antalis
Ohio University, Chillicothe Campus, Mr. J. Steven Philips
Raymond Walters General and Technical College, Dr. James E. Cebula
Shawnee State General and Technical College, Mr. Frank Taylor
Sinclair Community College, Mr. Jack Morton
Southern State Community College, Mr. C. Wayne Jones
Stark Technical College, Mr. Jack Harris
Terra Technical College, Ms. Mabel Young
Toledo Community and Technical College, Dr. Robert Somogye
University of Akron, Ms. Anna P. Barnum
University General and Technical College, Cincinnati, Dr. Patrick Kumph
Washington Technical College, Mr. Joe Testerman
Wayne General and Technical College, Mr. Bob McElwee
Youngstown State University, Dr. John Coffelt
Youngstown State Community and Technical College, Dr. Violet Boggess and Dr. Bari Lateef

JOIN US . . .

OATYC

OHIO ASSOCIATION OF TWO-YEAR COLLEGES

NEEDS YOU!

OATYC provides:

—Professional Liability Insurance of $300,000.
—An open forum
—A vehicle for communication between administrators, faculty and support staff
—Collective political input into higher education for the State of Ohio
—A way of significantly influencing the directions of two-year education
—A newsletter to inform members of the proceedings and activities of the OATYC
—A journal for consistent exchange of scholarly views and concepts

PURPOSES:

1. To provide an organization in which all groups related to two-year colleges (administrators, faculty and support staff) can discuss mutual problems and and act to resolve them.
2. To foster cooperation and communication between member institutions.
3. To provide a representative voice giving the viewpoint of two-year colleges to the Ohio Board of Regents and the State Legislature.
4. To identify and improve the status, prestige and welfare of all two-year colleges in Ohio.
5. To cooperate with other Ohio agencies, organizations, colleges and universities in research and activities that promote the effectiveness of higher education in Ohio.
6. To promote articulation among the institutions of education in Ohio.
7. To take such action as will increase the contribution of the two-year colleges to the total education processes in the State of Ohio.

1978 OATYC OFFICERS & BOARD MEMBERS

President
Thurman Grass
North Central Technical College

President Elect
David Miller
Michael J. Owens Technical College

Immediate Past President
Max Covert
North West Technical College

Membership Chairman
Sally Garst
Central Ohio Technical College

Treasurer
Rose Cost
Central Ohio Technical College

Recording Secretary
Molly Failes
Terra Technical College

Corresponding Secretary
Mary Witwer
University of Akron, Community & Technical College

BOARD MEMBERS

Sharon Darmofall	Lorain Community College
Scott Hagen	Wayne General & Technical College
J. Richard Seston	Cincinnati Technical College
Bill Zimmerman	Terra Technical College

CUT HERE

OATYC APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP

OATYC
c/o MARY WHITMER
302 E. Buchtel Ave.
Akron, OH 44325

PLEASE CHECK ONE:

——**Plan A. I am enclosing $10 for regular membership dues for 1978.**

——**Plan B. I am enclosing $28 for 1978 dues and classroom liability insurance (3 years) coverage.**

——**Plan C: I am enclosing $38 for 1978 dues and classroom and laboratory (risk) liability insurance (3 years) coverage.**

Name: _____
(Print) (Last) (First) (Initial)

Two-Year College: _____

Address: _____ **Area of Interest** _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Preferred Mailing Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____ 36

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
FEB 28 1992